

CLERK: (Read record as found on pages 1271-72 of the Legislative Journal.) 45 ayes, 0 nays, 4 excused and not voting, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: LB 532 passes. LB 683E.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a motion on the desk. Senator Warner would move to return 683 to Select File for specific amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, the amendment was passed out on your desks this morning. This is the bill that will establish a procedure to be used in the future for the oil overcharge money. What the... You will recall, when we discussed LB 432 that was passed the other day, as well as when we have discussed LB 683 on General File, that I indicated that there were two projects that had been submitted last year that were not included in the appropriations. Those two projects were in the category of agriculture and specifically involved Hastings Pork request and a Valmont Industries request. I indicated always that the committee's position in excluding those from the appropriation of 432 that they should continue to go through the process or review that they are going through as to their eligibility and that there would be ample time then on a subsequent appropriation bill or the regular appropriation bill this year to include those for discussion by the Legislature. There is concern that, because of the fact that LB 683 has the emergency clause, it takes effect immediately, that one could read into it that those two projects would have to start all over. And I have indicated everyone that I am aware of, certainly in the committee discussions and floor discussions we have constantly indicated that those two projects could still come back yet this session to be considered by the Legislature. What this amendment does is makes it clear that those two projects do not have to start over again, they are still pending as a result of being excluded in 432. It changes nothing, but it makes it very clear that at least they do not have to start all over again. That is the purpose of the amendment. It doesn't authorize them, it doesn't deny them, but it merely puts in place what we have constantly indicated would be the case, that they could be considered in the subsequent appropriation bill even though they were excluded in 432.